



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,483	01/31/2002	William Budge	MTI-31079-C	7667

22202 7590 09/18/2003

WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S C
111 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE
SUITE 2100
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

EXAMINER

MANDALA, VICTOR A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2826

DATE MAILED: 09/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/066,483

Applicant(s)

BUDGE ET AL.

Examiner

Victor A Mandala Jr.

Art Unit

2826

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the DRAM, SRAM, logic circuit, and the system on a chip must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure, which is not enabling. **The second nonconductive silicon layer** is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2826

3. Claim 24 recites the limitation the first layer and the second layer. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
4. Claim 25 recites the limitation the first and second spacers. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
5. Claim 27 recites the limitation the DRAM. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
6. Claim 29 recites the limitation the SRAM. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. Claim 30 recites the limitation the first nonconductive spacer. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 24 and 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent No. 6,121,086 Kuroda et al.

8. Referring to claim 24, a semiconductor memory device comprising: at least one first word line comprising p-type silicon or polysilicon, (Figure 25 #7g2 transistor Qp Col. 13 Line 67 and Col. 14 Line 1), and a first nonconductive silicon oxide layer, (Figure 25 #12a examiner's

Art Unit: 2826

label #100 and Col. 10 Line 15); at least one second word line comprising n-type silicon or polysilicon, (Figure 25 #7g2 transistor Qn Col. 13 Line 67 and Col. 14 Line 1), and **a second nonconductive silicon layer**, (Figure 25 #12a examiner's label #200 and Col. 10 Line 15); and wherein the first layer is thicker than the second layer.

9. Referring to claim 26, a semiconductor memory device, wherein at least one of the first word line or the second word line form part of a DRAM array, (Col. 9 Line 16).

10. Referring to claim 27, a semiconductor memory device, wherein the DRAM array is part of a system on chip, (Col. 9 Line 17).

11. Referring to claim 28, a semiconductor memory device, wherein at least one of the first word line or the second word line form part of a SRAM array, (Col. 37 Line 26).

12. Referring to claim 29, a semiconductor memory device, wherein the DRAM array is part of a system on chip, (Col. 9 Line 17).

13. Referring to claim 30, a multi-gate semiconductor device comprising: at least one first p-type gate, (Figure 25 #7g2 transistor Qp Col. 13 Line 67 and Col. 14 Line 1), surrounded by a first nonconductive silicon oxide layer; and at least one second n-type silicon gate, (Figure 25 #7g2 transistor Qn Col. 13 Line 67 and Col. 14 Line 1), surrounded by a second nonconductive silicon oxide layer, (Figure 25 #12a examiner's label #200 and Col. 10 Line 15); wherein the first nonconductive spacer is thicker than the second nonconductive layer.

14. Referring to claim 30, a multi-gate semiconductor device, wherein the device is part of a logic circuit, (Col. 37 Line 15).

Art Unit: 2826

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,121,086 Kuroda et al.

15. Referring to claim 25, a semiconductor memory device, wherein the first and the second spacers are formed using tetrathylorthosilicate/ ozone deposition in one step process.

Initially, and with respect to claim 25, note that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, In re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685; In re Luck, 177 USPQ 523; In re Wertheim, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594, 596 (CCPA); In re Marosi et al., 218 USPQ 289 (CAFC); and most recently, In re Thorpe et al., 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC, 1985) all of which make it clear that it is the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that, as here, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Note that Applicant has burden of proof in such cases as the above case law makes clear.

As to the grounds of rejection under section 103, see MPEP § 2113

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor A Mandala Jr. whose telephone number is (703) 308-6560. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8am till 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (703) 308-6601. The fax phone numbers for the

Application/Control Number: 10/066,483

Page 6

Art Unit: 2826

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

VAMJ

September 8, 2003



NATHAN J. LYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800